



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

with the infinitive to include undesirable qualities. But it is simpler to suppose that he wrote εἰώθασι γὰρ οἱ πολλοί. Cf. Plato's *Laws* 916 D: εἰώθασιν οἱ πολλοί.

PAUL SHOREY

VENTIDIUS AND SABINUS

Some years ago I printed in *Classical Philology* (VIII, 389-400) an article in which I essayed to prove that a candidate for office jestingly alluded to in a certain letter of Cicero (*Fam.* xv. 20) could not possibly be the well-known Ventidius Bassus. Toward the end of the article I set down also a considerable number of reasons for believing that neither could the *Sabinus mulio* of the pseudo-Vergilian *Catalepton* x be Ventidius. Of this article I am reminded by certain remarks of Professor Tenney Frank recently published (*Class. Phil.*, XV, 117). He mentions me with Th. Birt as opposing the identification of *Sabinus mulio* with Ventidius (which Mr. Frank for the sake of his thesis is bound to uphold), and states just two of my points as "the chief objections recently offered against the identification." These two points only he proceeds to answer. The casual reader might well imagine that I had myself put them so prominently forward as practically to rest my case upon them. I did not, and do not, so distinguish them. The second of them, indeed, was distinctly set forth as directed, not against the identification as such, but against Bücheler's peculiar argument for it. The case rests on a dozen or twenty reasons, not on these two, which might, indeed, be entirely sacrificed without substantially impairing the validity of the main proposition.

But let us examine Mr. Frank's answers, which, as he affirms, make my objections disappear. He advances in defense of Bücheler a statement which Bücheler was certainly far from having in mind himself. Bücheler surely was thinking of the praetor as sitting on the regular tribunal praetorium, which he assumed was close by the temple of Castor. I pointed out that the praetor's tribunal is now known to have been far from Castor's temple. Mr. Frank answers on Bücheler's and his own behalf that in the late republic "the praetor's court was for some reason frequently held at the tribunal Aurelium, which was at the lower end of the forum and apparently near the front steps of the temple of Castor." This is all news indeed to me! I am not ignorant of the few ancient references to the tribunal Aurelium, but I had therefrom supposed the precise site of it (though it was doubtless in the Forum) to be indeterminable. That is the judgment of such men as Jordan and Hülsen. One might legitimately wonder on what Mr. Frank bases his assertion about its position. If I were to hazard a guess concerning the site, though I concede all the difficulties to be raised against the determination, I should be inclined to place it near the other end of the Forum, where the

rising ground gave convenient opportunity for the construction of the *gradus Aurelii*, whence the populace, as from the seats in a theater, viewed the operations at the tribunal. Steps and tribunal perhaps disappeared in the rebuilding at that end of the Forum in the last years of the republic and first of the empire, along with the construction of the great basilicas. At any rate they are not later referred to. It appears quite improbable to suppose, as Mr. Frank perhaps does, that the steps up to Castor's temple were the *gradus Aurelii*. I also am aware that certain judicial sessions were held (it does not appear how often) at the Aurelian tribunal. But these had appeared to me to be not of "the praetor's court," properly so denominated, but of certain *quaestiones*. Yet even if all that Mr. Frank so unhesitatingly affirms could be true, it would yet be unreasonable to imagine that a reference to the praetor sitting in court (if that were, as Mr. Frank believes it is, the meaning in *Catal.* x) would naturally suggest to a Roman the tribunal Aurelium rather than the tribunal praetorium.

The other of Mr. Frank's answers is that Vergil in speaking of Gallia in *Catal.* x might well have in mind the Picentine birthplace of Ventidius, since "the northern part of Picenum was frequently called Ager Gallicus"; and by capitalization of both words Mr. Frank makes of the ager Gallicus of Picenum a geographical proper name. That appears to be unjustifiable. The demagogue tribune Flaminius, probably in 232 B.C., had evicted the Gallic inhabitants from a piece of territory in the neighborhood of Ariminum and had settled Roman colonists on it. This tract was henceforth reckoned as a part no longer of Gallia but afterward of Picenum. The violent political conflict that resulted in its acquisition was not forgotten and served to keep alive the memory of its former ownership; and in later days, when this northern part of Picenum was referred to, it was sometimes designated as the one-time Gallic territory of Picenum, to distinguish it from the rest of that region. I do not know any passages in ancient authors where it is spoken of plumply as Ager Gallicus, without distinct accompanying reference to the rest of Picenum. This ager Gallicus was not a geographical proper name, and Gallia would certainly not suggest to a Roman of 43 B.C. the Picentine territory. I venture to say it would not suggest it to an American of 1920 A.D., unless he felt he could not afford to give up the identification of *Sabinus mulio* with Ventidius. The Gallia of *Catal.* x was *lutosa Gallia* and it lay in the neighborhood of Cremona-Brixia-Mantua. In that region and that region only *Sabinus mulio* declares that he was born and bred and had always lived. The northern part of Picenum was not even *lutosa*; still less was it *Gallia*. It appears to me simply absurd to suppose that the author of *Catal.* x, if he wrote to satirize Ventidius, would so insistently locate the birthplace and unvarying habitat of his *mulio* a couple of hundred miles away from the cradle of Ventidius, and much farther yet from the scenes of his widely separated activities. And it should be remembered that there is not one jot or tittle of evidence even that *Catal.* x was

written in or during its earlier years circulated in Rome, where Ventidius was presumably well known. Mr. DeWitt's remark about portents, which Mr. Frank applauds, is apparently based on the curious assumption that no interpretation of *Catal.* x is reasonably possible that does not regard *Sabinus mulio* as actually a curule magistrate at Rome! The mischief is of course that these followers of Victorius (for the identification is not Bücheler's own, as Mr. Frank calls it) are caught by the mere coincidence with *Sabinus mulio* of the *mulio* nickname of Ventidius, and accordingly insist on interpreting the Catalepton skit in terms of the career of Ventidius, and not of the poem of Catullus, of which it is a palpable parody. In pursuance of that fixed idea they violently wrench all discordant elements into alleged accord and declare the resultant jangle a delightful harmony. Surely criticism ought to be conducted on more rigorous principles than this. My objections are far from being quieted. They are on the contrary more clamorous than ever.

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

FLORUS LUCAN AND THE EPITOMATOR OF LIVY

In the Historical Introduction to my edition of Lucan VIII, reviewed by Professor Ullman in the last number of *Classical Philology*, I had written p. xxiv. "Much of the difficulty concerning the relation of Florus' narrative to Lucan's would be removed by the assumption, to which there is no evident objection, that the *epitomator* of Livy made use of *Lucan* and that *Florus* used the *Epitome*."

Since in Mr. Ullman's quotation this passage is stultified by the omission of the "no" before "evident," the comment which he appends, "A desperate situation to call for so desperate a remedy!" is not as apt as to an uninstructed reader it might appear.

I content myself at present with correcting this error, as I have some hope that before long I may return to the general question.¹

J. P. POSTGATE

NOTE ON PLATO *REPUBLIC* 565 A

ἄνθρωπος δ' ἂν εἴη τρίτον γένος, ὅσοι αὐτουργοὶ τε καὶ ἀπράγμονες, οὐ πάντῃ πολλὰ κεκτημένοι· ὃ δὲ πλεῖστόν τε καὶ κυριώτατον ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ, ὅταν περ ἀθροισθῇ.

Plato is saying that the third and chief constituent of the population of a democratic city is composed of the small proprietors who, like the husband of Euripides' *Electra*, do their own work without the aid of slaves (αὐτουργοί) and who, absorbed in their own tasks, have little leisure or inclination to

¹ Professor Ullman has also called attention to this misprint. [EDITOR.]